

COURTS IN GREENLEE COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2016-2018 SUMMARY



LOCAL INITIATIVES, DRIVERS, AND PRESSURES

- Reduce travel and cost required to obtain COJET training by videoconferencing.
- Reduce high cost of contracting by joining statewide remote court reporters and remote video interpreters projects.
- Obtain offsite access to court records for key personnel (for telework and business continuity).
- Better preserve ageing audio court records.
- Work with county justice partners to eliminate re-keying of criminal data and improve accuracy.
- Enhance physical security within superior court building, especially for staff.
- Continue to enhance court website content.

CY 2013/14 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Obtained FTR Gold for Justice Court use; upgraded FTR Gold at superior court and instituted backup procedures for audio files.
- Upgraded courtroom audio system to eliminate inaudible periods that affected transcripts.
- Located a transcription service for superior court cases.
- Began distributing minute entries to attorneys electronically.
- Updated court's website to comply with Language Access requirements.
- Installed Adobe Acrobat Professional to create/modify Greenlee-specific court forms.

Statewide Projects: Impacts, Concerns, and Participation Plans

LJ CMS	Positive about reduction in manual keying and increase of data exchange possibilities; require equipment and training; will be early adopter (but little or no LJ input to plan).
JOLTSaz e-Filing/Std Forms	Looking to reduce manual input times; will be mid-cycle adopter. Recognize savings in clerk labor and paper; will improve filings from out-of-county attorneys; will be mid cycle adopter.
LJ EDMS	Will relieve courts' physical records storage pressures; will reduce time to fill requests; will be early adopters (but little LJ input to plan).
Bench Auto	Necessitates new equipment and judge training but saves paper, printer ink, and staff time; will be mid-cycle adopters.
Architecture	Don't perform local development; upgraded items in retirement/containment status.
Risk	Probation still dependent on "Dave's Program" for financials.

TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS					
Project	Year/ Status	Project Detail Provided			Comments
		Full¹	Skeletal²	Mention³	
Courthouse Security	FY16		X		Superior Court building
Courtroom Video Recording, Conferencing & Evidence Presentation	FY16		X		Superior Court; Exhibit One, incl. Video Remote Interpreting
Preserve Audio Records	FY18		X		Superior Court Clerk
Interface Programs	FY18		X		All courts/Local justice partners
Improve Access to e-Records	FY18		X		Key court personnel
Courtroom Wi-Fi Access	FY16		X		Superior Court

Note 1:

An “X” in “Full” indicates that the court has provided full detailed information about the project according to the general parameters outlined in the Commission on Technology’s Project Management Methodology. Also, risk analysis, impact, project costs and funding information has been provided.

Note 2:

An “X” in “Skeletal” indicates that the court provided detail about the local project in the master projects listing spreadsheet. Complete information, usually risks, impact analysis, project costs and funding, was not provided.

Note 3:

An “X” in “Mention” indicates that the court mentioned this project in a summary or listed it in an initiative. It may have been a phrase or a full paragraph of description, but did not contain detailed project-oriented information. If these projects are related to pursuing standards or directions already adopted (e.g., OnBase EDMS implementation, Jury+ upgrade, digital audio in the courtroom), then any mention which includes appropriate funding information is sufficient.